DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 281 465 HE 020 369

AUTHOR Mitchell, Mary B.; Wheeler, Daniel W.
TITLE A Grounded Theory of Chairperson Management Strategy. ASHE 1987 Annual Meeting Paper.
PUB DATE Feb 87
NOTE 34p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education (San Diego, CA, February 14-17, 1987).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Role; College Faculty; *Department Heads; Higher Education; *Interprofessional Relationship; Job Satisfaction; *Leadership Responsibility; Productivity; *Teacher Administrator Relationship; Teacher Effectiveness
IDENTIFIERS *ASHE Annual Meeting

ABSTRACT

Management strategies used by effective department chairpersons to enhance faculty performance and work satisfaction were investigated. Interviews were conducted with outstanding department heads at the University of Nebraska at Omaha, the University of Missouri at Kansas City, and Wichita State University. Grounded theory research was employed, which utilizes the constant comparative method of simultaneous data collection and analysis to inductively generate theory. The grounded theory proposes that: (1) effective chairperson management strategy is associated with leader values, department stages, management strategies; and (2) factors that interact to maximize chairperson leadership are congruence at faculty and administrative levels and the control of resources by chairpersons. Three stages of development for departments were identified: regenerating, maintaining, or actualizing. The stage of development of a department was important to the selection and implementation of management strategies. Management strategies used by department heads were designed to facilitate department communication, collegiality, viability, and visibility while promoting resource acquisition and control necessary for faculty productivity in teaching, research, and service. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED281465

A GROUNDED THEORY OF CHAIRPERSON MANAGEMENT STRATEGY

by

Dr. Mary B. Mitchell

Bishop Clarkson College of Nursing

Omaha, Nebraska

and

Dr. Daniel W. Wheeler

University of Nebraska - Lincoln

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

ASHE

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education, San Diego, February 14-17, 1987.

HE 020 369

ASHE

ASSOCIATION
FOR THE
STUDY OF
HIGHER EDUCATION

The George Washington
University
One Dupont Circle, Suite 630
Washington, D.C. 20036-1183
(202) 296-2597

This paper was presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education held at the San Diego Hilton in San Diego, California, February 14-17, 1987. This paper was reviewed by ASHE and was judged to be of high quality and of interest to others concerned with the research of higher education. It has therefore been selected to be included in the ERIC collection of ASHE conference papers.

A GROUNDED THEORY OF CHAIRPERSON MANAGEMENT STRATEGY

Crisis in higher education--characterized by decreased resources, increased accountability, vigorous competition for fewer students, and changes in the demographics and values of students--has resulted in renewed interest in faculty productivity. External and internal pressures are causing a drop in faculty morale which can result in decreased productivity and quality of performance at a time when the cry for accountability is heightened and the professorial work force is diminished (Bowen & Schuster, 1986). Because new faculty may not be available in sufficient numbers by the twenty-first century, effective and efficient utilization of the current core group of faculty is imperative.

Academic departments are the primary work environments for faculty; therefore, chairpersons are the key first-line managers accountable for promoting faculty performance and work satisfaction. There needs to be a better understanding of the management strategies (leadership activities and actions) used by successful chairpersons, those known for effecting high faculty morale and optimum faculty productivity in teaching, research, and service. There needs to be a better understanding of the "process" of effective academic department leadership.

The primary purpose of this study was to develop a grounded theory of chairperson management strategy generated from data obtained

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

during interviews of outstanding department chairpersons at three urban, comprehensive universities located in three midwestern states. The study was guided by two major research questions: (1) What are the management strategies used by effective department chairpersons to enhance faculty performance and work satisfaction? (2) What are the principal factors associated with the process of effective department leadership and faculty management strategy? (Mitchell, 1986)

The process of academic department leadership effectiveness could not be explained by previous leadership theory which has focused on singular concerns such as decision-making styles, leadership competencies, strategic planning, or organizational behavior. This study differs from previous research in three important ways. First, it focuses on leadership and organizational effectiveness at the first-line management level. Second, it studies academic department effectiveness from the perspective of faculty performance and work satisfaction as influenced by chairperson strategies. Third, it utilizes a theory generating research approach which frees it from overly confining, predetermined theoretical propositions. Practitioners and researchers can realize greater benefit from the identification of critical factors in, and their relationship to, the process of chairperson management strategy effectiveness.

As a preface to the discussion of the constant comparative method of generating grounded theory, the importance and major characteristics of the naturalistic paradigm are elaborated to promote understanding of the essential premise of this research study. Naturalistic paradigm, the new postpositivist "view of the world,"

is one frame of reference for defining and organizing knowledge. The old, positivist paradigm supports hypothetico-deductive methodology while the new paradigm utilizes a more holistic-inductive approach to research.

The new paradigm, described in Lincoln and Guba's (1985) book on Naturalistic Inquiry, is a movement from (1) simple to complex realities, (2) hierarchic to heterarchic concepts of order, (3) mechanical to holographic images, (4) determinacy to indeterminacy, (5) linear to mutual causality, (6) assembly to morphogenesis, and (7) objective to perspectival views. The grounded theory approach to research both requires and is enhanced by the naturalistic paradigm. To adequately examine the complexities and interrelationships of basic processes, the whole and the parts must be examined simultaneously with a view of the world that allows for multiple realities and co-existence of seeming paradoxes. In keeping with the perspective of the naturalistic paradigm and as evidenced in the data, an interactional, multidimensional, nonlinear pattern was found to more adequately conceptualize the process of chairperson effectiveness.

Constant Comparative Method

Grounded theory research, named and initially elaborated by Glaser and Strauss (1967), utilizes the constant comparative method of simultaneous data collection and analysis to inductively generate theory. It is a systematic approach to empirical research that emphasizes both the discovery and the verification of theory.

"Because the scientist generates constructs (theory) from the data rather than applying a theory constructed by someone else from another data source, the generated theory remains connected to or 'grounded' in the data" (Stern, 1985, p. 149).

The constant comparative method depends upon a procedure called "theoretical sampling" which "is a process of data collecting . . . whereby the analyst jointly collects, codes and analyzes [the] . . . data and decides what data to collect next and where to find them, in order to develop . . . [a] theory as it emerges" (Glaser & Strauss, 1967, p. 45). In other words, the emerging theory guides sample selection, the search for data most relevant to the generation and verification of theory.

Only "outstanding" chairpersons were interviewed based on the emerging core variable--<u>leadership effectiveness</u>. The core variable is the "central, composite process in the problem studied. . . [it] . . . describe[s] central themes of social interaction . . . [and] transcend[s] a variety of contexts" (Stern, 1985, p. 156). Outstanding chairpersons are those who have successfully (effectively) enhanced faculty performance and work satisfaction. The demographic nature of the sample which included nineteen department chairpersons, representing three institutions and a wide range of academic disciplines, is summarized in Tables 1 and 2 .

"Coding" of data into categories is the primary analytical procedure which facilitates the generation of theory. The researcher is looking for the "factors" that explain the phenomenon under study.

TABLE 1

Demographics of the Sample: Nineteen Departments from Three Universities

Department Data	Range in Sample	Average in Sample
Number of Department Faculty		
Total full-time faculty	10-24	15
Full professors	4- 9	7
Associate professors	0- 6	5
Assistant professors	0- 6	3
Instructors	0- 5	0.5
Vacancies	0- 2	0.5
Part-time/adjunct faculty	0-23	5
Highest Degree Awarded	B.S.-Ph.D.	Masters
Description of Chairpersons (19)		
Years in office	1-18	6
Term of office	2- 3	3
Anticipated tenure	2-20	8

TABLE 2

Academic Disciplines Represented in the Sample

Academic Discipline	Number in Sample
Physical Sciences	
Chemistry	2
Biology	1
Physics	1
Geology	1
Engineering	1
Humanities	
English	1
Communication	2
Music	1
Art	1
Behavioral Sciences	
Political Science	1
Economics	1
Psychology	1
Sociology	1
Applied Sciences	
Law and Society	1
Public Administration	1
Education	2

The discovered factors are the "categories." At first, data elements are coded into as many categories as possible. Next, as data emerge that fit existing categories or as other categories are developed, the researcher begins to conceptualize the "properties" or dimensions of each category and the relationships among categories, the "theoretical propositions." A set of hypotheses, integrated into an analytical scheme, comprises the "grounded theory" (Stern, 1985).

"Verification" is a major component of grounded theory research, first to verify the existence of categories (the factors of the emerging theory) and second to verify the properties and relationships of the categories. "The traditional rules of verification are relaxed somewhat in order to promote the discovery of theory" (Conrad, 1982, p. 243). An example is ongoing theoretical sampling rather than the use of a predetermined random sample.

Finally, it should be pointed out that there is a difference between substantive and formal theory. "Substantive theory" refers to a specific context or domain of inquiry. It is closer to specific real-world situations. "Formal theory" deals with more general domains or processes within social science, such as leadership and socialization. It is much more general and conceptually abstract, and therefore may not be as useful to the improvement of practice (Glaser, 1978). In this study, the focus was on generation of a substantive theory about academic department chairperson leadership. The intent was to generate concepts and propositions useful for improving chairperson leadership and faculty management strategy effectiveness.

Procedure

The qualitative method of data collection utilized was an open-ended interview process formulated around the two research questions. The option of patterning one's questions on the subject's responses to prior questions makes this technique more flexible and thus, more desirable for exploratory research. In addition, as categories and their properties emerge, it is important to verify their accuracy with the subjects of the investigation (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). Interviews ranged from forty-five to seventy-five minutes in length and were tape recorded to verify written notes taken by the researcher. Copies of the researcher's notes were analyzed for important factors, the categories related to the leadership effectiveness of the chairpersons. As categories were defined, individual datum elements were coded into as many categories as possible to promote the analysis of the properties and relationships of the categories.

Initial interviews were conducted at the University of Nebraska at Omaha (UNO). The first round of interviews, using five chairpersons, helped to focus the research and define initial categories. A second round of interviews, using five additional chairpersons at UNO, revealed other categories and allowed for greater conceptualization of their properties and relationships (further delimitation of the theory). At that time, the decision was made to extend the theoretical sampling process to the University of Missouri at Kansas City (UMKC) and Wichita State University (Wichita), two urban campuses selected for their comparability as peer institutions

(Carnegie Council, 1976). A total of nine chairpersons were interviewed at these two institutions.

Letters were sent to the chief academic officer at each institution requesting the identification of outstanding departments with notably active and effective chairpersons: "Criteria for judging departments and chairpersons should be those most appropriate to your institution and environmental context. We might suggest productivity; economic efficiency; quality faculty, curriculum, and students; and/or faculty morale."

At the conclusion of the interviews at UMKC and Wichita, the factors, their properties, and interrelationships had been sufficiently developed and verified to conclude the study. Theoretical sampling and constant comparative analysis of data must continue until all major categories (factors) and their relationships have been "theoretically saturated." "The criterion for saturation is that no additional data can be found which further embellish the theory" (Conrad, 1978, p. 103). The theory must be sufficiently dense, well integrated, testable, and must explain the problem; in other words, it should represent the "truth"--the culturally and perceptually determined reality (Sergiovanni, 1984).

The grounded theory discovered in this study is first stated as theoretical propositions. The propositions are then supported by evidence presented discursively in sections corresponding to the factors of the theory: leader values, department stages, management strategies, congruence level, and resource control.

A Grounded Theory of Chairperson Management Strategy

Proposition I. Three interacting factors are associated with the process of effective chairperson management strategy:

A. Leader Values

B. Department Stages

C. Management Strategies

Subproposition. Humanistic and professional values held by the chairperson, and an understanding of the department's stage of development, are factors that interact to guide the selection and implementation of management strategies that effectively enhance faculty performance and work satisfaction.

Proposition II. Two factors interact to maximize chairperson leadership and management strategy effectiveness:

A. Congruence Level

B. Resource Control

Subpropositions. 1. Chairperson effectiveness is augmented (a) when each strategy is congruent with leader values and department stage; and (b) when congruence exists among faculty and administration as a mutual acceptance of leader values and department stage. 2. Chairperson effectiveness is further maximized through the empowerment permitted by control of financial resources.

Evidence of the Theory

Evidence is presented to support the propositions of the grounded theory and to enhance understanding of the process of effective academic department leadership. The interaction of leader values, department stage, and management strategy explained many similarities and differences in the process. Chairpersons idealizing the integration of values, stage, and strategy were not, however, equally effective. It was found that conditions of congruence and resource control added to effectiveness.

Leader Values

A value is a principle or quality which is intrinsically valuable or desirable. In the academic department, and to some extent in the institution, basic values must be shared values and are among the key elements of an organization's culture. It is important to note that to value something is to give it power; this is the force that intermingles with other factors in the theory to explain effectiveness.

Values most often expressed in the statements and actions of the outstanding chairpersons include: unselfishness, fairness and honesty, mutual trust and respect, professional freedom and responsibility, proactive leadership, open communication, collegiality and cooperation, flexibility and versatility, and collective excellence before individual achievement. Other authors refer to leader values as "qualities" or "competencies" essential for effective leadership.

In this situation where the leaders receive little or no formal training, the values seem to be an internal guidance system that allows them to be flexible and effective chairpersons.

"Humanism"--the recognition of the unique value and worth of every human being--means that chairpersons appreciate the differences among faculty and can utilize individual talents and contributions within the department. Chairpersons interviewed recognize the importance of knowing what is most important to each individual. They use that knowledge to solve problems creatively and reward and challenge individuals on differing but equitable criteria.

One chairperson indicated that it was important that all members of the department be considered "equals." He stated that "part-time instructors are just as valuable to the department as full-time full professors." "Opportunities for professional development should be afforded all in the department." Apparently this feeling of equality is shared, because money earned by faculty from consultation activities is voluntarily turned into the department general fund. This fund provides travel monies to all faculty and is distributed without regard for the dollar proportions contributed by each individual. The criterion used by the chairperson in awarding funds is the potential value of the experience for the individual and, thus, for the department. The roles of communicator and motivator, as identified by the Nebraska Task Force Study (Wheeler, Creswell, Mitchell & Seagren, 1986), are guided here by the value of equality. (See Appendix A)

Values related to appropriate management styles differed greatly. Several chairpersons felt very strongly that they should follow a "democratic" process of decision making. They see themselves as colleagues and facilitators who "serve" the faculty. "You have to give them what they need and take care of daily, mundane management tasks." Department effectiveness is made possible through the diversity and balance among the faculty. Chairperson management strategy effectiveness can be attributed to "congruence" with faculty values and goals.

Other chairpersons expressed the importance of stronger, more "autocratic" leadership. One noted that previously all decisions were "held up to a vote." This might work in some situations, but here, senior faculty were not producing at full potential and the "department was not acting as a unit." The value of professional freedom and democracy had produced a group of faculty with "a lot of promise but not much performance." Only through strong leadership was this chairperson able to turn an average department into a very effective one in terms of overall research performance and quality of graduate students.

"Common goals" for a department that are compatible with "individual goals" are consistently seen as important, regardless of the chairperson's management style. A "team" approach is viewed as preferable to reliance on the productivity of a few stars. The value of "cooperation" is expressed as "the need for involvement." Chairpersons feel that involvement of faculty in their work, their department, their academic discipline, and their institution is essential to department effectiveness. "This is the only real mechanism for learning and growing." Many chairpersons actively push

faculty involvement in institution-wide committees due to the "broadening" that results from "seeing how others do things" and "looking at the whole picture." The value of "team work" can guide successful fulfillment of both communicator and academic leader roles. (Appendix A)

The observation about the importance of involvement and teamwork is supported by the extensive study of faculty morale completed by Bowen and Schuster (1986). They discovered that high faculty morale was associated with the "phoenix factor" or the joy of survival, success in the fight to survive. It was the "esprit de corps"--winning as a team--not individual performance that made the difference.

"Open, frequent communication" is a primary concern; however, each handles the problem in a slightly different manner. One stated that he has an open door policy and that he prefers one to one communication because he is working with many different personalities. "This requires a great deal of patience" and "you spend a lot of yourself." However, the time spent can prove "very advantageous when you later need faculty support on important issues."

Another chairperson moved his office to the same floor as the faculty. He saw this as important for "communication" and for "collegiality." He also makes it a practice to go to the faculty member's office when discussing that person's concern. He feels that this promotes more "equality" and "openness" in discussions. Other chairpersons focus on written memos and faculty committees to promote good communication.

Faculty evaluation is clearly one of the chairperson's most difficult tasks. All chairpersons recognize the importance of "equitable reward" of faculty on criteria most suitable to individual strengths, but they find it difficult to be perceived by faculty as "fair and objective." One chairperson, in consultation with department faculty, developed two matrix forms for evaluation--one for those excelling in teaching and one for those more involved in research. This unique evaluation tool utilizes a computer program to generate a score for each faculty member. Through another formula, merit raises are given based on relative weight of each score in light of total department performance. Unfortunately, at this institution as well as the others, the reality is a three to five percent pay raise, even for highest merit. The role of motivator is difficult when extrinsic rewards are limited and chairpersons must continually develop informal reward systems.

"Unselfishness" was a value noted when chairpersons commented that they "must not compete with the faculty." Conversely, they do have to be good "role models" and contribute beyond a management role. It seemed to be this element of the chairperson's task that caused the most sentiment related to burnout. "After leaving the chair position, what is left?" "You have tried to maintain credibility but have had no time to perpetuate a research focus." "They will retire me to a yearlong sabbatical, but what do I do with that?" A conflict between the roles of counselor and academic leader was often in evidence.

Where do leader values originate? Only after verification of the values category was this question asked. One chairperson quickly responded that he had developed his values and management techniques by watching his father as an administrator in a university. Another chairperson stated that his values were solidified after serving under a chairperson "who did everything wrong." "I vowed that I would be different; that I would treat faculty with fairness, respect, honesty, and openness."

Department Stages

Departments can be categorized into one of three stages of development: (1) regenerating, (2) maintaining, or (3) actualizing. The stage of the department's development is evidenced by the charge given to the chairperson by the dean, or by the charge or goal set by the chairperson and the department faculty as the priority focus for action. The terms used to define the three stages are based on the evidence of this study. Other stages and terminology may be more appropriate in other situations. Much of the concept of stage is in the eyes of the beholder. In other words, identification of stage from the evidence is based on the attitudes expressed by the chairpersons interviewed, with little correlation to the "age" of the department, chairperson, or faculty.

The three stages of development for departments are defined below followed by descriptions of departments displaying these characteristics. "Regeneration" implies that a department is refocusing energies--growing and changing. Many of the departments were focused on "regeneration," a reflection of the post-retrenchment era in higher education which means living with the concept of negative growth, or regeneration of hidden potentials in light of necessary changes.

The term "actualizing" is utilized to describe those departments that have not been faced with negative forces, but have not yet realized their maxmium potential. Actualization comes from the term used by Maslow (1971) to describe a never ending quest for knowledge and understanding and the realization or maximization of potential. In the case of departments, this would be the ultimate level of functioning--challenging and enhancing new heights of personal performance and department excellence.

"Maintenance" departments are in the middle, where full potential has been achieved and maintaining that level of performance is the primary goal. This is a difficult stage to equate to effectiveness as the term is typically used in the literature. The construct of effectiveness, as currently socially determined, is associated with "growth" in quality or quantity. Maintaining quality and quantity, however, should be seen as a reasonable element of effectiveness. Examples of the stages of department development are presented below.

One institution had recently had a change in the top administrative post. Several of the chairpersons at the institution referred to the new president's push for "programs more relevant to the 1980's." This proved advantageous to one department trying to establish a doctoral program, but a heavy challenge to another department trying to maintain viability with an academic discipline that is no longer a "hot topic." The latter department has chosen to emphasize quality in scholarly output and in graduate programs to attract better, if not more students. In addition, maximizing service possibilities to meet changing needs in the community has helped promote department

visibility as a viable unit within the institution. Rather than electing to be a "maintenance stage" department, they chose to "actualize" potentials not previously recognized or promoted.

A department in a similar situation has chosen to "maintain" its status as one of the top departments in the nation within that academic discipline. This is an example of how the theory helps to explain differences found in effective departments and chairpersons. A combination of a different stage, different values, and different strategies, ones more congruent for this department, has resulted in effectiveness equal to the previously mentioned department.

At another institution, faculty from two departments had been combined. "Regeneration" was evident due to a changing emphasis from teaching to research as well as the reorganization. A chairperson was hired from outside the institution who had little previous faculty experience but a great deal of administrative experience and a fine scholarly publication record. She was not greeted with unanimous approval. She was seen as a threat due to her apparent affiliation with the administration responsible for the unwanted reorganization, her exemplary scholarly productivity, and her female status in a predominantly male department.

The strategy that proved most effective in promoting faculty acceptance was one that utilized interaction and congruence of values and stage in a very unique way. The faculty had previously focused on their teaching role and most master's degrees awarded did not require a thesis. The chairperson combined a commitment to the student with the universally recognized value of thesis preparation in graduate programs to promote faculty research productivity. Graduate assistants are now required to write a thesis and as the faculty

supervise student research, they become increasingly involved with their own research.

The positive faculty motivation can be explained by Maehr and Braskamp's (1986) personal investment theory of motivation. According to that theory, motivation or personal investment in work results from personal factors interacting with situational factors including its "meaning." In this case, the "meaning" of the situation was changed to positively promote department effectiveness and faculty investment in research. The "management of meaning" has been cited by Whetten and Cameron (1985) as one of eight principles for effective leadership. The communicator role is extremely important to effective motivation.

The stage of development of the individual department is an important workplace condition found to influence the selection and implementation of management strategies. Department stage does not appear to directly relate to the developmental stage of the institution, but can be influenced by it. There was also no apparent link with the career stages of the chairperson and/or the faculty in the department.

Management Strategies

To illustrate the multitude of interactions of strategies, stages, and values in producing effectiveness, it is more meaningful to develop the story discursively. To that end, some of the more outstanding examples from the data are described. Where possible, reference is made to the relationship to faculty performance and work satisfaction; however, many chairpersons spoke of strategies in the collective sense of "department effectiveness."

When asked about the morale of their faculty, chairpersons provided a variety of interesting comments. Most noted low morale only in relation to disappointment with university administration rather than a problem of satisfaction with academic work. "That stuck professor is just mad at the university." Some chairpersons see low morale as a healthy problem--motivating faculty rather than stifling them. Most declared that they do not worry about the few "stuck" faculty but rather, spend their time "helping those who are willing to produce and who need help the most." It was clear that total department productivity or effectiveness was the ultimate goal and that this could best be promoted through support of the majority of the faculty--the "movers."

Many chairpersons mentioned strategies to meet the faculty's need for "recognition." Where possible and appropriate, chairpersons named assistants, area heads, or committee chairs to increase faculty status. The increased involvement has reaped benefits in terms of increased commitment and motivation. This practice can also give faculty an opportunity to experience administration before it is their turn to be chairpersons.

Strategies aimed at facilitating a "nurturing environment" for faculty through tangible resources and intangible blocks of time for research were also mentioned. Each chairperson has a slightly different focus depending on the characteristics of the faculty members in the department. Chairpersons are concerned with removing causes of frustration and minimizing conflict situations. The prevailing philosophy is that "the chair works for the faculty rather than the faculty working for the chair," and "the job should work for the individual rather than the individual working for the job." One chairperson found that the best intangible motivator for his faculty was to schedule classes to fit their individual lifestyles. He spends a great deal of time working on the schedule to produce the best fit for both faculty and students. All chairpersons expressed a humanistic concern for the professional needs of faculty not currently being met by the work environment.

Management strategies used by department chairpersons are aimed at facilitating department communication, collegiality, viability, and visibility while promoting the resource acquisition and control necessary for optimizing productivity in teaching, research, and service. Productivity is enhanced by motivation strategies such as positive evaluative feedback, growth contracts, nonacademic internships, retraining, financial rewards, and peer recognition. Strategies aimed at facilitating faculty self-development include professional meeting monies, decreased class load, utilization of institutional programs for instructional improvement and grant writing, and advocacy for tenure and promotion attainment. Many of the strategies can be found in books by Bennett (1983) and Tucker (1984) that address the issue of chairperson development needs. A national study is under

way at the University of Nebraska which will result in training materials that highlight the people development roles and strategies of department chairpersons. For more information, contact John W. Creswell, Project Director at 1221 Seaton Hall, University of Nebraska Lincoln, Lincoln, NE 68588-0638.

Congruence Level

As the evidence previously presented indicates, congruence between management strategies, leader values, and department stage enhances chairperson effectiveness. Basic beliefs (leader values) and department goals (stage) understood by the chairperson must be shared at the faculty and administrative levels to strengthen long-term effectiveness. Conversations with chairpersons revealed that lack of congruity above and/or below typically resulted in replacement of the chairperson and a perceived need for stronger department leadership.

Resource Control

Control over financial resources, institutionally derived and/or departmentally generated, is an additive factor that is the key to the maximization of chairperson effectiveness. Resource control influences the extent that some strategies can be utilized. Many of the chairpersons have been very effective in finding resources to benefit individual faculty as well as the department as a whole. They expressed concern at this point in the discussion about the tape recorder. Apparently, some resource generation and control techniques are not fully condoned by the system. However, no one insisted that the researcher turn off the recorder giving the appearance that it must be a fairly common practice to "find as much money as possible, any way possible."

One of the most interesting stories of resource acquisition was one chairperson's "luck" in sitting next to an elderly lady at a cocktail party, discussing the importance of composition skills in the pursuit of higher education. Unbeknownst to the chairperson, this individual was a wealthy heiress very interested in promoting the teaching of English composition skills. She eventually gave the department a very large sum of money to be used for hiring faculty, specifically to teach composition, and for the professional development needs of these faculty. Half of the money was put into a trust which is managed quite successfully by the donor, ensuring continuing funds for the department.

Much variation exists in the amount of resource control given chairpersons by deans. Some deans give the entire department budget to the chairperson while others keep total control over the budget in the dean's office. Where the dean retained control, there appeared to be more "outside the system" fund-raising. Chairpersons who were given responsibility for the department budget were able to work more effectively within the system, although most also sought external funds.

The term "leveraging" of resources was used by several chairpersons. This is an expression referring to the cooperative use of mutual resources between departments and even institutions. As an example, one department offers a dual degree with a department at another institution, sharing faculty to offer a program that could not be provided by either institution or department by itself. Such a dual effort accomplishes several things. First, faculty can broaden their horizons and try new areas within or close to the discipline.

Second, higher caliber students are attracted to the program, enhancing the reputation of the departments (which enhances their ability to secure institutional funds). Third, departments can experiment without committing long-term dollars to risk-taking ventures.

Evidence has been presented to illustrate the importance of congruent interaction of leader values, department stage, and management strategies for assuring department chairperson leadership effectiveness. In addition, effectiveness is enhanced by congruence at faculty and administrative levels and by the control of resources by chairpersons. The theory explains the similarities and differences in the process of effective chairperson management strategy--strategy aimed at enhancing faculty performance and work satisfaction.

Implications

This paper has addressed the process of academic department leadership effectiveness. The development of theory specific to higher education institutions provides direction for future research. Institutions and departments benefit from the identification and description of effective menagement strategies for maximizing the talents and energies of faculty. Utilization of management strategies is further enhanced by the discovery of factors or conditions impacting chairperson leadership effectiveness.

The results of this study also point to concerns about the selection, training, and support of academic department chairpersons including related implications for institutional policy and practice. One dilemma that stands out is the chairperson's image. One chairperson commented that faculty view those who take the chairperson job the same way they would view a "nun who leaves the convent to move

into a house of prostitution." "It is the hardest job in higher education because you get very little support for administrative tasks."

Another major dilemma is the time commitment. It was very evident that these effective chairpersons were spending much more than the usual one-fourth to one-third FTE allotted to them for administrative tasks. Resource acquisition and control alone is a major time commitment. And yet, to call chairpersons full-time administrators would be incongruent with prevailing collegial values, and thus, would hinder leadership effectiveness. What chairpersons need is support--help with the time-consuming management tasks--allowing them to be scholars as well as leaders.

Finally, it is important to continue the quest for better understanding of the processes involved in higher education administration at the first-line management level. It would be beneficial to continue this study beyond the urban university context. Grounded theory research is appropriate for these tasks because it is ideally suited to the study of basic processes and the generation and verification of relevant theory. It was and is a profound experience for the researcher.

REFERENCES

Stern, P. N. (1985). Using grounded theory methods in nursing research. In M. M. Leininger (Ed.), Qualitative research methods in nursing. Orlando, Florida: Grune & Stratton.

Tucker, A. (1984). Chairing the academic department: Leadership among peers (American Council on Education). New York: Macmillan.

Wheeler, D. W., Creswell, J. W., Mitchell, M. B., & Seagren, A. T. (1986, April). Academic department chairpersons: Enhancing faculty growth and departmental vitality. Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association meeting, San Francisco.

Whetten, D. A., & Cameron, K. S. (1985). Administrative effectiveness in higher education. The Review of Higher Education, 9(1), 35-49.

APPENDIX A

Management Strategies of Department Chairpersons

Appendix A

Management Strategies of Department Chairpersons

BASIC ROLE DESCRIPTORS	SPECIFIC ACTIVITIES
Communicator	
Honesty	- Provide straightforward feedback (Positive and Corrective) - Demonstrate consistency in response about important issues
Openness	- Office arrangements show accessibility - Be a good listener Go to faculty - on their turf Be a "sounding board" Explore faculty interests
Keep people informed	- One-to-one conversations - Drop in to faculty offices - Newsletters about accomplishments - Weekly memos - Communication toward department goals
Keep positive tone	- Tell people they're doing a good job (if they are) notes, letters, comments - Provide models - self and others - Develop others' ideas as well as one's own ideas - Provide influence and negotiation Speed up journal acceptances - Meet with new people every two weeks - Investigate issues before jumping to conclusions
Facilitator	
Obtain whatever is necessary to accomplish tasks--remove obstacles	- Avoid saying "no" too often - Provide informal organization - group building - Ask the necessary questions - "Open forums" - "Dragging people along" - Adjust loads/schedules - Follow up on needed activities
Look for requests and proposals	- Outside funds - Papers at national meetings - Research Council - Summer research fellowships - Maintenance and securing of equipment - "Broker of" the interests of faculty
Mentor	- Holding and socializing beginning faculty - Help hook up these faculty with faculty who have published - Help person along toward promotion and tenure

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

BASIC ROLE DESCRIPTORS	SPECIFIC ACTIVITIES
Academic Leader	
Preside over academic program Develop "a community of scholars"	- Address curriculum concerns - Attract and select quality graduate students - Initiate Distinguished Faculty Awards - Recognize "currency" of the various fields - Encourage innovation in teaching, research, and service - Promote broadening activities such as dual degree programs, new courses, and innovative course delivery
Preside over direction of department	- Conduct meetings - "conduct the orchestra" - Seek consensus on key issues - Manage internal dialogue - Discuss congruence of individual and departmental goals
Selection of faculty	- Identify "curious people" - Hire people with experience - they bring grants and connections with them
Encourage people to be better (growth, development, and excellence)	- Structure faculty exchanges about their work - Distribute their articles and products - Ask for courses faculty want to teach - Recommend for review panels
Set academic expectation	- Everyone will be scholarly - Information on kinds of scholarly activities - Allocation of Effort Reports - Stick up for quality faculty not fitting usual mold or model
Motivator	
"Protective role" - "Shield"	- Keep "static" out of the way - buffering - Integrate ideas of new faculty - Development of internal P & T document
"Coach"	- Evaluation process - Goal setting with faculty - List of faculty accomplishments - Conferencing - Reinforce performance and expectations Notes Verbal praise Recommendations
Developmental Approach "developing people"	- Arrange "matches" of people's interests and organizational needs "Differentiated staffing" - "Seed money" - discretionary money - Use of faculty leaves - Find leverage - what's meaningful to the individual - Rotation of assignments for self-development - "Drastic actions" for "remediation"
Model	- Display high energy and positive attitude

BASIC ROLE DESCRIPTORS	SPECIFIC ACTIVITIES
Counselor	
"Hand holder" Perspective taker	- Assessment of when people are down and respond to needs - Help faculty sort out payoffs - Help faculty "cut their losses" - Encourage retirements - Recognize various personal development needs and opportunities for faculty - Help relieve pressures and stress (e.g., Associate Professor) - Provide emotional support or link to needed support
Politician	
Link between department and central administration	- Convey importance of the work of the department
Represent the department outside	- "Fight the departmental battles" a) Determine and implement "tradeoffs" b) Work for credit for faculty maintenance of the institution activities (advising, recruiting, teaching) c) Promote and legitimatize individual scholarly activities of faculty d) Secure outside dollars
Manager of "Administrivia"	
Handling paperwork and basic organizational tasks	- Reporting - Budgeting - Scheduling - Social events (e.g., softball games)